



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/696,533	10/30/2003	Renzo Colle	34874-350 / 2003P00635US	7832
64280 7590 10/14/2008 MINTZ, LEVIN, COHN, FERRIS, GLOVSKY & POPEO, P.C. ATTN: PATENT INTAKE CUSTOMER NO. 64280 ONE FINANCIAL CENTER BOSTON, MA 02111				
EXAMINER ANDERSON, FOLASHADE				
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
3623				
MAIL DATE		DELIVERY MODE		
10/14/2008		PAPER		

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

10/696,533

**Applicant(s)**

COLLE ET AL.

**Examiner**

FOLASHADE ANDERSON

**Art Unit**

3623

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --  
**Period for Reply**

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 01 August 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-22 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SI/309)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

### **DETAILED ACTION**

1. This is a second non-final office action in response to Applicant's submission filed on July 10, 2008. Currently, claims 1-22 are pending. Claims 1 and 15-22 have been amended.

### ***Response to Amendment***

2. Applicant's amendments to the specification are sufficient to overcome the drawing objections set forth in the previous action.

3. Applicant's amendments to claims 15-22 are sufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C. 101 reject set forth in the previous action.

### ***Response to Arguments***

4. Applicant's arguments, with respect to the drawing objections to item 765, figure 7 and 1085, figure 8 have been fully considered and are persuasive. The drawing objection of the previous action has been withdrawn.

5. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Applicant argues: (1) in which field human resource can be monitored and scheduled as well as central workshop human resource in order to facilitate the completion of a service action (first full paragraph, page 18), (2) a service action will require field resources as well as central workshop resources (first full paragraph, page 18), (3) the first task item takes place both before and after the second task item (second full paragraph, page 18), (4) a user can be presented with a list of service actions and that

such selection results in the automatic association of the service action with resource information and that task items forming part of such service action are automatically scheduled (third full paragraph, page 18), (5) the scheduling of resource which necessarily require task to be conducted at a field location as well as task to be conducted at a central workshop location (third full paragraph, page 18) and (6) a service action in which [h]a piece of equipment is serviced at a field location as part of a first task item, a part from the piece of equipment is serviced at a central workshop as part of a second task item, and the part for the piece of equipment is serviced at the field location as part of a third task item which occurs subsequent to the second task item at the field location.

In response to applicant's argument (1) and (2) that the references fail to show certain features of applicant's invention, it is noted that the features upon which applicant relies (i.e., "in which field human resource can be monitored and scheduled as well as central workshop human resource in order to facilitate the completion of a service action" and "a service action will require field resources as well as central workshop resources" respectively) are not recited in the rejected claim(s). Although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are not read into the claims. See *In re Van Geuns*, 988 F.2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993).

In response to applicant's arguments (3), the Examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that the arguments are direct to newly added amendments. The recitation of **"a first portion of the first task item occurring before the second task item and a**

**second portion of the first task item occurring after the second task item**" is taught by Donnelly "the external database includes a MAF database defining projects (service action) task within projects and efforts within task (portion)" (col. 9 lines 35-37). The system is capable of assigning tasks (col. 10, lines 33-35) therefore it is inherent that once a task is scheduled the efforts (portions) within that task are also scheduled.

In response to applicant's arguments (4), the Examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that the arguments are direct to newly added amendments. The recitation of **"based on user input selecting a service action from a list of service actions"** is taught by Hanagan "the screen shows the user the products and services to which the customer is subscribed and allows the user to add (select) new products and service subscriptions (service action)" ( 0181 and figure 12). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to include the invention of Donnelly and Hartlaub the service selection list as taught by Hanagan since the claimed invention is merely a combination of old elements, and in the combination each element merely would have performed the same function as it did separately, and one of ordinary skill in the art would have recognized that the results of the combination were predictable.

In response to applicant's argument (5), the Examiner respectfully disagrees. The argument is a general one therefore the Examiner is not sure which resource Applicant is arguing. Claim 15 *paraphrased*: scheduling of service actions based on user input for the service action select from a list of service action's task, where resource information is associated with a task (first and second). The resource

information includes human resource availability information (field and central workshop). The specified human resource (field and central workshop technician) is associable with the task. This claim has been given its broadest reasonable interpretation, in general there the need for a resource is determined once the user selects the service action to be performed. The tasks are scheduled and based on the general resources need the system determines the availability of those resources which are needed to complete the task. However the specific resource (technician) is only associable, capable of being assigned, with the task and not actually assigned, scheduled, to the task. In other words the specific resources are not scheduled when the tasks are scheduled. Donnelly teaches "a programmed computer system (computer readable medium is inherent) for identifying candidate human resources to be assigned (it is old and well known that if the resource is actually assigned then it is also an associable resources) to a project (service action/task) where the project requires predetermined skills and predetermined time availability (resources information associated with service action/task)." (col. 2, lines 46-49). The instant claim is an obvious variation of the prior art therefore unpatentable.

In response to applicant's arguments (6), the Examiner respectfully disagrees and notes that the arguments are directed to newly added amendments. The recitation of **"a first task item to be performed at a field location for a piece of equipment, a second task item to be performed on at least one part of the piece of equipment at a central workshop location that is different from the field location, and a third task item to be performed with the at least one part of the piece of equipment at**

**the field location after completion of the second task item.”** The argument made in regards to this claim is direct to the old and very well known act of refurbishing an item to be placed back in service. For example in the field of uniform servicing (service action) a field technician (route representative) is required to conduct a portion of the service action in the (uniform pick up for cleaning and repair), a portion is preformed at a central location (Stratford, CT) is preformed by a central worker (seamstress to repair minor tears) and third portion performed in the field (return of uniforms) by a field technician (route representative). Evidence for this old and well known concept is evidenced in the attached Unifrist Uniform Rental Program (published 12/04/2001) see pages 5, 12 and 13. However in the actual claim language here does not positively recite this concept. This claim is directed to a single step method claim of associating based on user input, resource information to task item i.e. one type of data to another. The data itself is non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the specific data. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP, 2106.

6. It is noted that the applicant did not challenge the officially cited facts in the previous office action(s) therefore those statements as presented are herein after prior

Art Unit: 3623

art. Specifically it has been established that it was old and well known in the art at the time of the invention that:

- that mobile communication was available for task assignment, see the rejection of claim 7
- an employee would convey to his employer or the customer the amount of time spent on a task, see rejection of claim 12.



***Claim Objections***

7. Claims 15 and 21 are objected to because of the following informalities: extremely difficult to interpret. These claims are not in the proper format to convey the steps of the claims. "Where a claim sets forth a plurality of elements or steps, each element or step of the claim should be separated by a line indentation, 37 CFR 1.75(i)." See MPEP 608.01(m).

8. Claim 21 and 22 is objected to because of the following informalities: Claim 21 appears to be a method claim thus implying multiple steps to achieve a useful, concert and tangible result; however this claim has only one step, **"associating, based on user input"** which only associates the data of a resource information to a task. Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101***

9. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 based on Supreme Court precedent, and recent Federal Circuit decisions, the Office's guidance to examiners is that a § 101 process must (1) be tied to another statutory class (such as a particular apparatus) or (2) transform underlying subject matter (such as an article or materials) to a different state or thing. *Diamond v. Diehr*, 450 U.S. 175, 184 (1981); *Parker v. Flook*, 437 U.S. 584, 588 n.9 (1978); *Gottschalk v. Benson*, 409 U.S. 63, 70 (1972); *Cochrane v. Deener*, 94 U.S. 780,787-88 (1876).

An example of a method claim that would not qualify as a statutory process would be a claim that recited purely mental steps. Thus, to qualify as a § 101 statutory process, the claim should positively recite the other statutory class (the thing or product) to which it is tied, for example by identifying the apparatus that accomplishes the method steps, or positively recite the subject matter that is being transformed, for example by identifying the material that is being changed to a different state.

Here, applicant's method step of claim 21 "**associating, based on user input**", fails the first prong of the new Federal Circuit decision since they are not tied to another statutory class and can be preformed without the use of a particular apparatus. Thus, claims 21-22 are non-statutory since they may be performed within the human mind.

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

10. Claims 15-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 15 the preamble states "A tangible computer-readable storage medium having embodied thereon a computer program configured to schedule the performance of service actions that involve activities at multiple locations, the medium comprising one or more code segments configured to[:]." However the subsequent step of the claim provides no connection as to how the association of various types of data produces the intended outcome of the claim as stated in its preamble, the scheduling of performance service action.

Claims 16-20 depends from claim 15 therefore suffer similar deficiencies.

11. Claims 21-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Claim 21 the preamble states "A computer-implemented method for scheduling the performance of service actions that involve activities at multiple locations, the method comprising [:].". However the subsequent step of the claim provides no connection as to how the association of various types of data produces the intended outcome of the claim as stated in its preamble, the scheduling of performance service action.

Claim 22 depends from claim 21 therefore suffer similar deficiencies.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

12. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

13. Claims 1-6, 9-12, 14-16, 19 and 20-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donnelly et al (US Patent 6,049,776) in view of Hartlaub (US Publication 2002/0087116 A1) and Hanagan et al (US Publication 2001/0056362 A1).

In regards to claims 1, 15 and 21 Donnelly teaches **a computer system for scheduling the performance of service actions that involve activities at multiple locations, the system comprising:**

- **an engine that associates** (col. 2, lines 1-5), **based on user input** (# 100 of figure 3), **resource information for both a first task item to be performed at a field location** (figure 53 ) **and a second task item to be performed at a central workshop location that is different from the field location** (figure 53), **the first and second task items to be completed as part of a service action** ( figure 3; where in order for the action to be complete the employee must be assigned by a manager and the employee performs the task as such the either the manager or the employee is in the field or the central workshop), **a first portion of the first task item occurring before the second task item and a second portion of the first task item occurring after the second task item** (col. 9 lines 35-37, col. 10, lines 23-25, where the efforts within the task are equivalent to portions) ; **and**
- **a repository of resource information associable with the first and second task items** (col. 9, lines 35-37), **the repository including field human resource information** (col. 9, lines 38-40) **so that a specified field technician is associable with the first task item** (col.10, lines 42-45), **central workshop human resource information so that a specified central workshop technician is associable with the second task item** (col.10, lines 42-45), **and work area information for the central workshop location so that a specified work area is associable with the second task item** (col. 10, lines 7-8), **wherein:**

- o **the field human resource information includes availability information for field technicians** (col. 10, lines 23-39 where calendar file contains availability of each human resource),
- o **the central workshop human resource information includes availability information for central workshop technicians** (col. 10, lines 23-39 where calendar file contains availability of each human resource), and

Donnelly teach a technical assistance request that defines an engagement for which human resources are required (col. 7, lines 60-65); however, he does not expressly teach **a selection service with a service order template, the service order template defining**. Additionally Donnelly does not teach **the work area information includes availability information for central workshop locations**.

Hanagan teaches **a selection service with a service order template, the service order template defining** (0262)

It is old and well known in the art of scheduling that it is protocol to check the availability of a location prior to assign a task to it as evident by Hartlaub (par. 0057) in the scheduling of appoints in the analogous art of patient appointment scheduling.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to include the teachings of Hartlaub, room availability, and the Donnelly in the invention of Donnelly to alleviate the manual task of scheduling service request (Hanagan 0277) and allow for a scheduling routine that the system automatically implements and verifies (Hartlaub 0020).

As a point of clarification Donnelly does not expressly teach a "first" and "second" or a "field" and "central workshop" worker. Donnelly teaches a human resource (col. 2, lines 46-48) and he also teaches the user (human resource) can be remote (col. 8, lines 41-42). The Examiner interprets the invention to be capable of use by both works located internally (central workshop) as well as in the field. As such the claimed invention of the instant application is used for assigning field and central worker, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made could have used the invention of Donnelly to implement a predictable variation resulting in essentially the same types of assignments, see *KSR International Co v. Teleflex Inc*, 550 U.S. \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

Further in regards to claims 15 and 21 which are the medium and method respectively for interacting with the system of claim 1. These claims are implied and depend upon the system of claim 1 and therefore are rejected for substantially the same reason given above with respect to claim 1.

In regards to claims 2, 16, and 22 Donnelly teaches:

- **the first task item includes a field human resource skill requirement** (col. 26, lines 40-45),
- **the second task item includes a central workshop human resource skill requirement** (col. 26, lines 40-45),
- **the field human resource information includes an indication of a skill possessed by particular field technicians** (col. 10, lines 9-18),

- **the central workshop human resource information includes an indication of a skill possessed by particular central workshop technicians** (col. 10, lines 9-18),
- **the engine associates the specified field technician with the first task item only when the indication of the skill possessed by the specified field technician matches the field human resource skill requirement of the first task item** (col. 29, lines 9-22), and
- **the engine associates the specified central workshop technician with the second task item only when the indication of the skill possessed by the specified central workshop technician matches the central workshop human resource skill requirement of the second task item** (col. 29, lines 9-22).

As a point of clarification Donnelly does not expressly teach a "field" or "central workshop" worker. Donnelly teaches a human resource (col. 2, lines 46-48) and he also teaches the user (human resource) can be remote (col. 8, lines 41-42). Additionally Donnelly teaches that skill sets are known per employee (col. 10, line 9-10). The Examiner interprets the invention to be capable of use by both works located internally (central workshop) as well as in the field. As such the claimed invention of the instant application is used for assigning field and central worker, one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made could have used the invention of Donnelly to implement a predictable variation resulting in essentially the same types of

Art Unit: 3623

assignments, see *KSR International Co v. Teleflex Inc*, 550 U.S. \_\_\_, 82 USPQ2d 1385 (2007).

Further in regards to claims 16 and 22 which are the medium and method respectively for interacting with the system of claim 2. These claims are implied and depend upon the system of claim 2 and therefore are rejected for substantially the same reason given above with respect to claim 2.

In regards to claims 3-5 Donnelly teaches **the availability information is provided to the repository of resource information from a computer system other than the computer system for scheduling the performance of service actions** (col. 9, lines 31-34).

Donnelly does not expressly teach that the specific data recited in claims **the availability information is for field (central) technicians (or workshop location)**; however, these differences are only found in the non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the specific data. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, see *In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); MPEP § 2106.

In regards to claim 6 Donnelly teaches **wherein the engine is configured to send the first task item for the service action to a mobile client** (col. 8, lines 8-46).



In regards to claims 9-11, 9 and 20 Donnelly teaches **wherein the engine is configured to receive, from a mobile client** (col. 8, lines 41-46), **user input that specifies the specified employee to be associated with the task item** (col. 12, lines 63-67).

Donnelly does not expressly teach that the specific data recited in claims that the employee is a **field (central workshop) technician (or work area) to be associated with the first (second) task item** however, these differences are only found in the non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the specific data. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *MPEP* § 2106.

Further in regards to claims 19 and 20 which refer to the medium for interacting with the system of claims 9 and 10 respectively. These claims are implied and depend upon the system of claims 9 and 10 and therefore are rejected for substantially the same reason given above with respect to claims 9 and 10.

In regards to claim 12 Donnelly teaches **wherein the engine is configured to receive, from a mobile client** (col. 8, lines 41-46).

Donnelly and Hartlaub are silent on **user input that specifies an amount of time spent on the first task item or an amount of time spent on the second task item.**

Official notice is taken that is was an old and well know practice in the art at the time the invention was made that an employee would convey to his employer or the customer the amount of time spent on a task.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the old and well known practice of reporting time spent on a task in the in the invention of Donnelly to provide the system with an update on the employees availability.

In regards to claim 14 Donnelly teaches **wherein the engine is configured to receive, from a mobile client** (col. 8, lines 41-46).

Donnelly and Hartlaub are silent on **user input that specifies whether the first task item is completed or specifies whether the second task item is completed.**

Official notice is taken that is was an old and well know practice in the art at the time the invention was made that an employee would convey to his employer or the customer that a task was completed.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the old and well known practice of reporting task completion in the in the invention of Donnelly to provide the system with an update on the employees availability.

14. Claims 7, 8, 13, 17 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Donnelly et al (US Patent 6,049,776) and Hartlaub (US Publication 2002/0087116 A1) as applied to claims 1 and 15 above and in further view of ServicePower.com (www.archive.org/www.servicepower.com, published 11/11/2001).

In regards to claims 7, 8, 17 and 18 Donnelly teaches that once an employee's assignment has been updated the employee is sent notification of the schedule changes (col. 29, lines 18-22).

Donnelly and Hurlaub are silent on **wherein the engine is configured to send the first (second) task item for the service action to a mobile client.**

Official notice is taken that it was old and well known in the art at the time the invention was made that mobile communication was available for task assignment as evidenced by ServicePower (pg. 24).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the old and well known technology of mobile communications in the invention of Donnelly to support trends in innovations (ServicePower pg. 24).

Additionally the Examiner notes that neither Donnelly nor Service power explicitly teaches a **first (second) task item for the service action** is sent; however, these differences are only found in the non-functional descriptive material and are not functionally involved in the steps recited nor do they alter the recited structural elements. The recited method steps would be performed the same regardless of the specific data. Further, the structural elements remain the same regardless of the specific data. Thus, this descriptive material will not distinguish the claimed invention

from the prior art in terms of patentability, *see In re Gulack*, 703 F.2d 1381, 1385, 217 USPQ 401, 404 (Fed. Cir. 1983); *In re Lowry*, 32 F.3d 1579, 32 USPQ2d 1031 (Fed. Cir. 1994); *MPEP* § 2106.

Further in regards to claims 17 and 18 which refer to the medium for interacting with the system of claims 7 and 8 respectively. These claims are implied and depend upon the system of claims 7 and 8 and therefore are rejected for substantially the same reason given above with respect to claims 7 and 8.

In regards to claim 13 Donnelly teaches **wherein the engine is configured to receive, from a mobile client** (col. 8, lines 41-46).

Donnelly and Hartlaub are silent on **user input that specifies a spare part used in performing the first task item or a spare part used in performing the second task item** (ServicePower, pg. 8)

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to use the teachings of ServicePower in the invention of Donnelly to accurately account for spare parts to be bill the customer.

### ***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to FOLASHADE ANDERSON whose telephone number is (571)270-3331. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Thursday 8:00 am to 5:00 pm EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Beth Boswell can be reached on (571) 272-6737. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/Folashade Anderson/  
Examiner, Art Unit 3623

/Andre Boyce/  
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3623